

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/039,254	Applicant(s) ROSNER ET AL.	
	Examiner Eric B. Kiss	Art Unit 2192	

All Participants:

- (1) Eric B. Kiss.
- (2) Brent E. Vecchia (Reg. No. 48,001).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 March 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

30,33,43,49,56,62

Prior art documents discussed:

Yates et al., Borril

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

E. B. Kiss

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On March 13, 2007, the examiner proposed an Examiner's Amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, the examiner proposed incorporating similar language as recited in claim 53 into each of the independent claims. Mr. Vecchia declined the proposed amendment, asserting that claims as filed were sufficiently distinct and offered further clarification of the invention and the specific claim limitations believed to convey the inventive concepts. Upon further consideration and search, the examiner agreed with Mr. Vecchia that independent claims 30, 33, 43, 49, and 56 are allowable over the prior art of record. However, on March 14, 2007, the examiner proposed an amendment to clarify the language of claim 62. Mr. Vecchia authorized the proposed amendment to claim 62.